

WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1899.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid. DAILY, per Month ... DAILY, per Year BUNDAY, per Year DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month Postage to foreign countries added. THE SUN, New York City.

Pants-Riceque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Ktosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for pub must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Half a Million from Taxpayers.

When the present State Constitution of New York was amended in 1894 new and more efficient methods against improvident legislation were provided. No bill could be passed by the Legislature unless it had been printed and put upon the desks of the members, in final form, "at least three calendar legislative days before its final passage." In instances of local measures, imposing obligations or establishing | regulations in which the members of the Legislature generally might be expected to have but little concern, it was further provided that after such a bill had been passed by both branches, the house in which it originated should immediately transmit a certified copy to the Mayor of the city affeeted for a public hearing, and he should return it either approved or rejected.

Under these circumstances it is a disquieting discovery that since June 7 there should have been filed with the Comptroller of New York \$26,000 of claims for reimbursement of counsel fees and expenses incurred by officials in defending themselves against indictments which were dismissed, and these claims but forward under the terms of a law of which the legal and financial representatives had no knowledge, and the Mayor was never enabled to approve or reject, s law which seems to have been adopted somewhat surreptitiously. Still more disquieting is the knowledge that other suits of still larger amounts have been filed, and it is computed that the city of New York under the terms of this law may be muleted without recourse for from \$500,000 to \$800,000 for the alleged or allowed expenses of accused public officials under the Ahearn law, so-called.

When a public official in the proper discharge of his duty had been unjustly subjected to the costs of public trial on a charge of which he was acquitted, it may not seem unreasonable for the city, whose servant he is, to be called upon to reimburse him for his outlays in justifying his course or defending his title. In a great majority of the cases where claims for reimbursement have been filed, however, the defendants were clearly culpable and their expenditures were made for the purpose of evading trial. In some instances the statute of limitations was found to be operative; in others, the defences interposed were wholly technical; in others still, the absence of the complainant was relied upon, and in yet District Attorney in moving a dismissal of the indictment without trial, the liberty of the accused was never put in actual jeopardy. In one flagrant case the violation of law was undisputed and the accused was relieved from the penalties attached only by the intervention of a succeeding Legislature.

The dismissal of a criminal indictment found against a delinquent public official may be a fortunate matter for the accused, but it does not fustify the shifting of the burden of his expenses upon the taxpayers of the city. If a private citizen is unjustly accused, and is subjected to expense in law whereby the community should be of the case, taxed for his counsel fees and disburs ments, and there appears to be reason and wisdombin the intention ascribed to the Corporation Counsel and the Comptroller to resist by lawful means the payment of these claims by the city.

Dogma and Rationalism.

This correspondent is representative of several of our friends, in asking for an explanation of the term dogma, as used by us so often lately:

"Will you be kind enough to inform us regarding it was instituted, and how it came to be an authority before which reason, common sense and the teach ings of universal experience (the 'laws of nature') must most humbly bow the knee!

" NEW YORK, July 10." For religious dogma the term doctrine may also be used when it is doctrine which depends on other authority than the reason or natural demonstration. A dogmatic assertion, as every one knows, is an assertion without argument or evidence to prove it. According to the Greek derivation of the word, dogma is that which seems good to the utterer, an opinion. The term is used in the Gospel of LURB and in the Acts to designate the decrees of the Roman Emperors and in the Epistles to denote Jewish ordinances. In Christian theology it is dootrine settled and established by the au-

thority of the Church. The starting point of Christian theology is dogma necessarily, for theology proceeds from supernatural premises, and manifestly these cannot be established by merely natural evidences. It must begin with faith in an assumption of fact, which conflicts with natural evidence and possibility-the actuality of the Incarnationand back of that must be a similarly dogmatic assumption of the supernatural authority of the Scriptural record of the Incarnation. That is very obvious. The Apostles' Creed, for instance, is dogmatic in its positive assertion of events and facts which are purely supernatural and therefore outside of the domain of natural

Our correspondent asks how or by whom dogma was instituted. It was instituted in the very beginning of all religions as a necessity to claiming for them a supernatural foundation; there can be no the ology without it, for the ways of GoD and His very existence are past finding out by the merely rationalistic processes of men. Faith-"the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," as St. PAUL says-must be made to transcend reason in authority. "The teachings of universal experience," referred to by our correspondent, are of no avail in giving us knowledge of a supernatural world, for no human experience since time began has ever reached into that unseen and un-

The controversy of rationalism with faith | accepted the Commonwealth bill. in dogma or authoritative doctrine is as man, but at the term rationalism is used | only by citizens of the United States, who

seeable realm.

now more specifically it refers to a movement which began in Germany in the seventeenth century, was active there and in England and the Netherlands in the eighteenth century, and is now progressing throughout the Christian world. It allows to the Scriptures no other authority than they possess under the criticism of the reason-or, to use the words of Bishop POTTER, than they have as "a literature." Of recent years this controversy has been

intensified and extended by the popularization of the "Higher Criticism" of the Scriptures, as it is called. The agent in this country to that end was Dr. BRIGGS more conspicuously, but he is simply a disiple of a German school of criticism of long existence and has contributed nothing of original importance to its methods or conclusions. Being, however, a theological professor of so strictly dogmatic a Church as the Presbyterian, and his theories and methods contradicting radically the assumptions and conclusions of the Westminster Confession, his teachings startled the whole of the so-called orthodox community and aroused widespread doubts of the Bible in very many minds which had before accepted the dogma of its infallible inspiration without a shadow of questioning. This influence he extended further when he entered into the priesthood of the Episcopal Church, a Church which had been always free from discussion or inquiry as to the established foundation of its faith, and had expressed rather pure devotional sentiment.

Now, therefore, the question of the authority of the Bible, of the dogma of inspiration, is engaging all religious thought, and accordingly the very premise of Christian theology is brought under dispute in Christendom; and not merely among professional theologians and philosophers, but also among the great body of the laity, to whom before no thought of skepticism regarding it had ever occurred. By the side of the storm thus raised in the religious world the rationalistic controversy of the last century was of slight account and affected only a small area.

The Lattimer Riot Claims.

In rejecting Austria's proposal for arbitration for settling her claims for damages arising out of the killing of some of her subjects during the riots at Lattimer, near Hazleton, year before last, our Government is perfectly justified in holding that the facts present no case for arbitration. The Austro-Hungarian subjects were shot down by a Sheriff's posse which was doing its duty in checking and subduing a dangerous violation of the laws of the land. These foreign residents stood exactly on a footing with our own citizens in that respect. When Austria originally made its complaint, the matter was referred to the Governor of Pennsylvania. The courts of that State had already taken it up in the due course of law, and the Sheriff had been indicted for murder in firing on the mob. The jury acquitted him of the charge, after an elaborate and fair trial, and then the Governor declined to consider unlawful an act which the jury had virtually declared to be lawful.

The refusal, therefore, of our Government to put to arbitration the claim of Austria is based on the ground that the matter has others, because of the complaisant act of a aiready been adjudicated here by law. Aliens are entitled to protection in life and property like citizens, but they are also obliged to obey the laws in the same manner as citizens, and are subject to the same risks as the latter for refusing to obey them. In the Tousig case, which was that of a native of Austria domiciled here, but not naturalized, Secretary MARCY declared that "every nation, whenever its laws are violated by any one owing obedience to them, whether he be a citizen or a stranger, has a right to inflict the penalties incurred upon the transgressor." When a mob refuses to disperse at the reading of the Riot act, and the Sheriff is obliged to fire, the defending himself, there is no provision of nationality of people in the mob is no part | Senate cannot amend any bill so as to in-

> Austria is bound to see that her subjects here receive fair treatment, but she must also appreciate that it is of high importance to the stability of all government and of society that the majesty of the law should be vindicated. She should be satisfied now to leave the Lattimer riot where the American jury left it.

Will the Australian Constitution Uphold State Rights?

Now that the Australian Federal Constitution is certain to go into operation at no distant date, so far, at least, as New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania are concerned, it becomes a matter of interest to learn the essential character of this, the third instrument of the kind adopted by an English-speaking people. Additional information on the subject will be found set forth in the July number of the London National Review, by Mr. B. R. Wise, a member of the Sydney Parliament and a delegate from his colony to the Federal Convention, by which the so-called Commonwealth bill, or Australian Constiution, was framed.

In one fundamental particular, to wit,

a precaution taken to safeguard the rights of the smaller constituent States, the Australian Commonwealth departs from the precedent offered by the Dominion of Canada and follows the example set by the United States. The provision in the British North America act, which announces that the residue of unallotted powers belongs to the Dominion and not to the several provinces, makes that form of government a type of limited unification rather than a federation. Under our own Federal organic law, on the other hand, "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." That the framers of the Australian Constitution meant to follow the American rather than the Canadian pattern is evident from the preliminary resolution, which was adopted by the Federal Convention, and to which the Commonwealth bill was to conform: "The powers. privileges and territories of the several existing colonies shall remain intact, except in respect of such surrenders as may be agreed upon to secure uniformity of law and administration in matters of common concern." To secure the enforcement of this primary principle, the Commonwealth bill provides for a Federal Senate, in which each of the constituent States, whether small or large, shall be represented by six Senators, who are to be chosen, however, not by the Colonial Legislature, but by the people of their colony, Had not this precaution for the maintenance of State rights been presumed to be adequate, the smaller colonies, to wit, South Australia and Tasmania, would not have

Is the precaution adequate, as a matter development of the reason of of fact? The question can be answered

have been taught by a hundred and ten years' experience of the workings of a Federal organic law that, to safeguard the interests of smaller States, something more is needed than the announcement of a general principle, or even the establishment of a Senate originally based upon the theory of the equal representation of the States.

We have learned that it is scarcely possi-

ble to create too many barriers against the gradual subversion of that principle and against successive encroachments on the part of the central power. Not only does our Constitution provide that each State shall be equally represented in the Senate, but this provision is the only one which cannot be so much as touched by the machinery for amendment, which might sweep away all the rest of the instrument. But, it may be said, our Senate, while indestructible, might be reduced almost to impotence by constitutional amendments which should strip it of its power to propose amendments to bills for raising revenue, and of its powers relating to the confirmation of reatles and of Executive nominations, and by subordinating it in other ways to the popular branch of Congress. It might. for instance, be provided by a constitutional amendment that, after a bill emanating from the House of Representatives had been rejected once or twice by the Senate, the two houses should meet in joint session and the bill should then become a law, if it received a designated number of votes. The authors of our Federal Constitution took care that the rights of the smaller States, embodied in the Senate, should not be subsequently whittled away, for they made the process of constitutional emendation exceedingly complex and difficult. For the purpose of comparison, we here reproduce the article of the Constitution relating to the subject: "The Congress, whenever wo-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid, when ratifled by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof." A consideration of the words italicized will demonstrate that a constitutional amendment impairing the present powers of the United States Senate is, practically, imposelble.

Very different will be the position of the Senate, and of the State rights which it represents and is presumed to safeguard. under the Australian Constitution. In that instrument, if Mr. Wise's exposition of it be exhaustive, and assuredly he would not have overlooked a feature so vital, there is no provision that the equal representation of States in the Senate shall be exempted from the operation of the emendatory machinery. That equality, therefore, which is conceded to Tasmania and South Australia to-day, may be denied to them hereafter. Not only this, but the process of constitutional emendation will be incomparably easier in the Australian Federation than it is in the United States. Incredible as it will seem to our citizens, a bare majority in either house of the Australian Parliament may, without the consent of the other house, submit a proposal for an amendment of the Constitution, and that proposal will become a part of the Federal organic law, provided it is accepted by a bare majority of the electors voting, and, also, by a majority of the States. That is to say, when Queensland shall become a member of the Federation, that colony, acting in conjunction with New South Wales and Victoria, may, at any moment, deprive South Australia and Tasmania of their equal representation in the Senate. Nor is this all. The Australian Senate, unlike our own, cannot propose amendments to bills for the raising of money or for the appropriation of money. It may return such a bill with suggestions, which the House of Representatives is at liberty to reject. The crease any charge or burden on the people. In other respects it is supposed to have equal legislative power, but the equality is nominal, not real, as another comparison with the United States Constitution will show. If our Federal Senate persists in rejecting a bill emanating from the House of Representatives, there is absolutely no remedy except by embodying the bill in a constitutional amendment, which is practically unattainable. The Australian Constitution, on the other hand, provides that if the House of Representatives shall twice pass any bill to which the Senate declines to agree, both houses of Parliament may be dissolved, and if, after the dissolution, no agreement shall be reached, a foint sitting of both houses shall be held. If, in such foint session, the bill is passed by an absolute majority, it is

to become a law. It is obvious that by these provisions the equal representation of the States in the Australian Federal Senate is destined to be an illusory protection of State rights. We shall point out on another occasion that the maintenance of the rights of the smaller States is further threatened by the extraordinary powers of interference vested in the Federal Supreme Court, and by the institution of a Ministry solely responsible to the majority of the House of Representa-

Slaughter of the Seals.

Agent CLARRE, who has charge of the Government's interests in the Pribylov Islands, does little more than reiterate a familiar truth when he says that the provisions of the Paris tribunal in restriction of pelagic sealing are "totally inadequate." His visit to Scattle is too early for him to throw much light on the present sealing season, but he is "confident that seal life is not one-tenth as great as in former years."

The main point just now, it seems to us, is that nothing whatever has been done to repair the inadequacy of the Parls provislops, and that nothing will be done that can take effect during the present season. The futility of the Paris rules to protect the seal herd as it should be protected was urged by our Government upon England years ago, as soon as experience had demonstrated the need. So strongly did Congress feel upon the matter that the House passed a measure empowering esty and steadiness of habits. the Government to kill all the seals at once, unless it could obtain some modification of a system which was making them the victims of the pelagic hunters. The Senate did not concur in that policy, but it agreed that something must be done. At last Great Britain consented to send commissioners to Behring Sea, and their re port, like that of our own representatives. led to the hope of a remedy for the existing

evils. Then, however, came the deadlock in the Joint High Commission, which considered the seals among other subjects, so that now another season of slaughter is sure. Article IX. of the Paris rules declares that 'said concurrent regulations shall be sub-

mitted every five years to a new examination, in order to enable both Governments to consider whether, in the light of past experiences, there is occasion to make any modification thereof." This provision is mandatory; yet the first period of five years has already passed, and the work of revision is not done.

In a neighboring column of this issue of THE SUN we present the remarkable story of the beginning of the Kentucky Democracy's campaign for Governor as it is told by a Democratic journal of Texas. It is remarkable that out of the turmoil of Bryanism and anti-Bryanism, from which the Democracy everywhere is endeavoring to lift itself, the Kentucky anti-Bryanites should have chosen such representative as GOEBEL. He is described by those who advocate his election as a "brilliant" man. He appears, however, as the sort of politician that it is well to avoid.

CAPITAL AND LABOR'S TRUSTS. A Knight of Labor Looks on the Great

Combinations with Approval. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: In an article entitled "Trust Truths" in Thursday morning's issue of THE SUR Mr. N. Yelwor of Meriden, Conn., Informs, or tries to inform, an interested public that labor unions are trusts just as much so as those great industrial combinations which are at present receiving the kind attentions of the Legislatures of most of the States, not to mention political parties and conventions of refermers, and that the said labor unions should therefore refrain from attacking their all-too-powerful industrial coun-

terparts. I agree with your correspondent that labor unions are trustlike in recognizing, as the more generally execrated industrial combinations, better known as trusts, have long ago recognized, the fact that competition instead of being the life is really the death of trade, and they have evidenced that recognition by abolishing competition among their members. A member of a labor union is taught that he must not deprive his more fortunate fellow member of employment by offering his services for less than the wage scale adopted at a meeting by a majority of the members; in other words, the organization will not tolerate competition among the members. Were this not the case workmen would be continually in danger of being deprived of work by other wages than those who are fortunate enough to be employed, as is now done by the unorganized toilers. The above mentioned above tion of competition among organized workmen is to my mind the only excuse the enemies of labor organizations have for calling the organi-zations trusts.

While labor unions do not approve of the ganized toilers. The above mentioned aboil-

labor organizations have for calling the organizations trusts.

While labor unions do not approve of the methods used in the business transactions of the large industrial corporations, neither do they manifest the "violent opposition" to trusts as such. They realize that the principles embodied in the trusts of the present day are but the cruide and undeveloped principles of cooperation, the benefits of which cooperation accruing only to those more fortunate members of society lucky enough to pessess shares in the trust. They also coincide with the views expressed in a certain evening newspaper not long ago, that society is in its teething stage, the trusts being the teeth. The latter may hurt for a while; they come high, but we must have them; they will be of incalculable benefit when we shall have learned how properly to use them. No better example for universal cooperation can be found than that westem of cooperation in vogue at present in the great exclusive corporations, which have so few defenders.

As I have pointed out, Mr. Yelwor is mistaken when he contends that labor unions are violently opposed to the principles embodied in the trusta; it would be rather inconsistent for them to be so opposed, especially so in view of the fact that the organized workmen are doing their utmost to bring about the very system of cooperation for universal application that the trusts are at present maintaining for their own exclusive benefit. The following extract will bear me out in the above statement, an extract taken from the preamble and declaration of principles of one of the powerful labor organizations:

No. 21.—To establish cooperative institu-

izations: "No. 21.—To establish cooperative institutions, such as will tend to supersede the wage system by the introduction of a cooperative instrial system."
It will readily be seen that that labor organation at any rate does not indulge in the violent opposition" which the gentleman from onnectiont likens unto the "not calling the otte black." But don't think because labor settle that. But don't think because halor organizations do not, as a rule, violently attack runs they are, therefore, afraid of making themselves liable to be charged with calling the kettle black. Their only hope of realizing their desired universal cooperation is in the event of the present industrial combinations growing so vast and powerful that the vernment, in self-protection, will absor F. W., a K. of L. NEW YORK, July 9.

Capt. Frederick Watkins and the Gifted Steamship Paris. From the Evening Sun. been sentenced for cause to the suspension of his certificate and had with him in the infliction of that dreaded penalty the heartfelt avm pathy of so many people. No one of the thousands upon thousands of passengers who have crossed the Atlantic under the care of Capt. Frederick Watkins-not a solitary one of all of them-falls to feel and to express the strongest personal regret for the misfortune that has befallen him. Humanum est errare; and Capt. Watkins, he finally too, he of all of them, he made a mistake. The mistakes of lawyers are hung on trees; those of doctors are buried in the ground, but Capt. Watkins's mistake is high on a rock. He may ply the main no more for two years, and it is right that it is so, and he himself would be the last to have it other than it is.

All the same, it must be said that there never was a more popular or a more trusted man that walked the bridge in the roaring forties betwirt here and over vonder. That was the measure of him held by the travelling public and like was his esteem in the eyes of his He deserved it. He knew how to run his ship. He knew how to command; and no man that was ever in peril at sea with Watkins but wanted, if peril were to be run again, that Watkins should be the man to run

it with. If the Paris were to come off the rocks and presently go again to sea, restored in all her parts, with Watkins for her Captain, she would find all she could do when trade was plenty. There never was a finer ship affoat, and in hurricanes and wicked seas a better or an abler ship never crossed the wild Atlantic. People a-plenty have been heard to call her unlucky. Never was there a greater mistake. Twice at sea she broke a shaft and no one ever ost a dinner by it. Once at sea she had an accident in her engine room, the like of which no other vessel could have survived, but she came safe to port. And now this last time she has gone into the jaws of one of the worst traps that nature ever set for the drowning of man or the destruction of ships, and not a soul is jost or a pocket handkerchief wet!

Was there ever such a record? There is the luck that incurs no danger, but what is it compared with the luck which, when dangers befall, evades them?

On the Use of Wealth.

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-SITE "C." in to-day's Sun, in his "Advice for the Use of Wealth," has so nearly touched my case that I would like to say the matter cannot be urged too often or too emphatically; but I would like to add an amendment and have it so that one could borrow by showing a reputation for hon-

Life is not merely to exist, as many rich aup pose, but to be in a position to make the best use of our faculties, and this means oftentimes a little financial aid, that we may place our-selves in a position where we can put them to

e best use.
The rich are secure in their position, but
ey do not show that readiness I could wish
helping others to rise. It seems almost a
ty they cannot lose their wealth for a brief thelying contents are their wealth for a brief pace of time in order to make them have more ympathy for their fellow men. Very few of hem, apparently, give any thought as to how hey got their wealth, or whether another can require it in the same manner. But what they to think about, first, last and all the time, is the quickest way they can reach the one who makes a demand upon them with a refusal.

JULY 9.

New Pants. From the Trotter and Pacer. "Indiana panta" is a new name for hopples,

ly require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper course of study and furnished some evidence that he has a fair knowledge of the human commony and the sciences relating thereto. This regulation applies to Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews. It is objected to by Christian Scientists and Spiritualists, who stoutly maintain that to require the same education of them as of others engag-ing in the same business is to infringe their liberty of conscience and right to worship in their own way, although it is undeniable that when a man has once obtained a license to practice medicine upon proof of his scientific attainments he may follow any system he chooses. He may, if he see fit, rely solely upon mental processes. Every physician does largely take into account and rely upon the effect of the mind upon the body, especially in certain classes of cases. There are few to-day who pretend that the high potencies of homosopathy have any medicinal action, and it was a realization that their effect was due to the patient's imagination that led Mrs. Eddy, as she says, into her own extraordinary system. But homocopathists admit the existence of disease. They often administer drugs as heroleally as regular practitionerssometimes more heroically. They use surgery skilfully. In fact, it is often difficult to differentiate them from regular physicians by their practice alone; nor was there ever a time when they did not claim to be called physicians. The Eddyites, on the other hand, although eager to dub themselves "doctors of Christian Science." declare that they are not practitioners of medicine. Mrs. Eddy, as was fully pointed out in the North American Review for March, condemns not only drugs, remedies and instruments, but even hygiene, exercise and bathing. ments, buteven hygiene, exercise and bathing. Her method of curing disease is first to deny its existence and then to argue with it as one would argue with a Congressman. Herein lies at once the danger of her crazy method and the immunity of its practitioners from punishment under the law of this and many other States. A druggist who prescribes a proprietary nostrum or so simple a remedy as rhubarb or chalk mixture may be convicted of a misdemeanor. Our Supreme Court has so held in several cases. But it also has laid down in Smith vs. Lane 124 Hun, 632 the narrow rule that the use of drugs, medicines or instruments is an essential element of medical practice, holding, in substance, that the medical law was intended only to protect those seeking treatment secundara.

of drugs, medicines or instruments is an essential element of medical practice, boiling, in substance, that the medical law was intended only to protect those seeking treatment secundar orten from false pretenders to skill in the use of thangerous drugs or instruments, but not to protect from their mistake or folly, persons who, lared by wonderful promises of cure, submit themselves to the treatment of those avowedly discarding ordinary medical methods.

This case, expressly approved of in Ohio, Rhode Island and perhaps other States is the joy and bulwark of Christian Scientists. It was held to be inapplicable under the Netraska and Hilmois statutes; but from the last Lexislature of the latter State the Eddyites are said to have secured a proviso in the new medical law adopting its rule.

It will be remembered that a letter in The Sun of June it the accuracy of which has not been denied to my knowledge, showed that when Mr. Carol Norten, Mrs. Eddy's apostic hereabouts, was asked if he would dare to exclude medical aid and treat severed arteries, fractures, strangulations and contagious discases by mental processes he twice write that he preferred to shelve the questions. It must seem startling to a layman that a druggist violates the medical law by prescribing rhubarb, while a Christian Scientist who "thinks at" the severed artery of a child is exempt from the operations of that statute. And perhaps it may seem casy to rectify the anomaly by legislation. Two recent experiments in this direction may be producible for instruction.

In 1888 a bill was introduced into the Massachusetts Legislature defining the term "graction medicine" so as to include all methods of treating the sick and wounded for hire, including, of course, Christian Scientists and every sort of "helper" As was radically to be expected. Mr. William Lloyd Garrison and Prof. James—the latter of whom seems bent upon forcing Harvard, ancient mother of schodars and conservative men, to associate, in the public mind, with Mesidames Eddy and Piper—lift

upon forcing Harvard, ancient mother of schedars and conservative men, to associate, in the public mind, with Mesdames Eddy and Piper—lifted up their volces against the bin. These gentlemen represent the best of the host that raily to Mrs. Isolary support; sincere, concavel, intelligent, dearly loving to run a tit with the majority, with Athenian fondness for new things and not unwilling to fill the trump of Fame. Mr. Garrison, therefore, who a shorttime ago—I think it is the same Mr. Garrison—clamored at the top of his pen for academic rules to prevent the ingenuous youth of Harvard from infleting or submitting to the cautery of a boyish and rather willy initiation of a severe society—Mr. Garrison, who has harrowed all our feelings by pointing out the awful brutality of football, actually obstructed the passage of the law requiring Christian Scientists in Massandunstists on have as a condition of treating the sink the same education required of Protestants, Catholics and Jews engaged in the same business. And what was his delightful accument: As reported by the Christian Scientists, it seems to have consisted of two main oremines: First, "John I. Robinson, he, said they didn't know everything down in Judge." or, in common English, "the physicians don't know it all; therefore let all the ignorant have free field. Second, homeopathy was formerly ridiculed. The answer seems simple enough. Mr. Robinson, whose dictum has been much overworked, was right. In motioni science we know a good down more than was known in Jude. Moreover, Mr. Garrison lemself-down transported all theories emanating from that district. He may surpass the rest of us, but it may be doubted whether he gives to every one that asks of him or turns away from none who would borrow of him; and as for resisting what he considers evil he has a perfect manila for it, using the sooner with dealty effect. It is true that the metaphysical theory of that such protestes a properties when attenuated to a degree represented by flight and the protest of the su

the ladies, and abandoned the bantling upon Mrs Eddy's doorstep as cheerfully as he took it from its barent, whoever that may have been. It was another instance of an enthusiastic and organized few carrying their point, while the unorganized multitude was indifferent and apothetic. It seems obvious, therefore, that attempts at legislation in this matter should not be made ill-advisedly or without due organization.

But does it follow that we are without remedy under existing law? It would seem not

But does it follow that we are without remedy under existing law? It would seem not. It it can be demonstrated that a christian scientist has caused death by excluding proper medical or surgical treatment and substituting his mental processes—in such cases, for instance, as those submitted to Mr. Norton and "shelved" by him—it ought not to be difficult to obtain a conviction of manslaughter, if not of murder. The societies for prevention of crucity to children can act in the precuises. English courts are extraordinarily ienient with fanatics, but although Wagstaffe escapel junishment rifor to the enactment of the Frevention of Crucity to Children statute, that have seems to have been passed in consequence of his acquittal; and recently another member of the "Peculiar People," whose child died under a similar treatment by anointing with oil in Apostolle fashion, was convicted of

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND THE LAW.

To the Editorial quoting a number of the excerpts from Mrs. Eddy's book lately appearing in the reviews systematic effort was urged "to ferret out and punish" Christian Scientists. It omitted, however, to show the state of the law and the difficulties in the way of following its advice. It would be unfortunate if the adverse sentiment towards Eddy'sm aroused by exposure of its methods and the numerous reported cases of its manslaughters should be perverted or leasened by ill-considered action; it seems, therefore, worth while to make the situation clear.

No medical law of any State enjoins or prohibits any system of treating the sick, no matter how foolish, has been proposed. Those who assert the contrary do so ignorantly or with intent to mislead. What medical laws require, and in the opinion of the Supreme Court of the nation and of almost every state properly require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper take the contrary do so ignorantly or with intent to mislead. What medical laws require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper take the contrary do so ignorantly or with intent to mislead. What medical laws require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper take the contrary do so ignorantly or with intent to mislead. What medical laws require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper true can be a proper to the contrary do so ignorantly or with intent to mislead. What medical laws require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper true that the proper proposed. The contract of the nation and of almost every state properly require, is that no person shall practice medicine before he has pursued a proper true that the proper proposed. The contract of the nation and of almost every state properly require, is that no person shall practice.

THE QUESTION OF DOGMA.

A Layman in Defence of Bishop Potter. TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: In your editorial of to-day you seem to me unfair to Bishop Potter. I cannot find anything in his utterances which justifies the assertion that in his opinion the time for dogmatic religion has gone by. What is dogmatle religion? It is, of course, an accepted religious belief, just as the facts of any science are dogmas-astronomical. chemical or geological dogmas. Most of them cannot be explained, and, subjected to the test you apply to religious dogmas that "the authenticity and credibility of the witnesses must belief," would have to be rejected.

be attested by authority entitled to absolute What authority entitled to absolute belief do scientists rely upon for the theory or dogma of astronomy that the fixed stars are moving-Arcturus, and the fugitive star of Groombridge, for example, at a speed exceeding two hundred miles a second; that the dog star is leaving us and Arcturus approaching us, a fact of which the only witness is the spectroscope. showing the lines of the spectrum of the one shifting toward the blue and in the other evidence, and when Herschell stated that the only known fixed point in the universe is a star, and all earthly boundaries must be determined by it, he is not held to conflict with the actual facts, but to be relatively correct. The chemical reaction of an acid and an alkali results in a sait; but who knows why, and who can explain it, and yet who would doubt it simply because it cannot be explained? There are no witheses to the geological dogma that certain fossils indicate the tertiary period, but he who would question it would be regarded as narrow. The magnetism a name, but who can explain it? Why is it that some scientists accept all dogmas except those of Christianity, and refuse to apply the same reasoning processes to religious investigation—what lishon Patter claims "the spiritual intuitions, the conscience and the reason." The Christian dogma holds prayer to be as necessary for spiritual vision as the telescope is for the finite vision. Why, then, persist in entering this realim of investigation without the proper appliance when science recognizes aids as necessary for investigations in the contents. star, and all earthly boundaries must be derecognizes aids as necessary for investigations

recognizes aids as necessary for investigations in her realm?

Why regard the miracles of Christ as necessary evidences of His divinity? He did not so regard them. There is no recorded instance in which He wrought a miracle to prove His divinity. It was only as a reward of faith, never to induce belief that He wrought miracles. It seems to my mind greater he an evidence of His divinity than any miracles He wrought His turning from instructing the wise, the rich and the powerful to take little children in His arms and bless them; if He had been a human teacher He would never have done it. had been a human teacher lie would never have done it.

The battle which you claim is at hand between belief and unbelief has been going on for centuries, but the battlefield is the human heart. The blind negro in his hut is as sure of his dogma as the scientist of his, and he will win his battle against all the scientists in the world; neither negro nor scientist, may with honesty, safety or wisdom disdoin the proper method of scarching for the truth. A profound thinker, referring to the invstery of magnetism, was reminded that Christ said. "If the lifted up I shall draw all men unto Me," and from that day to this wherever He has been held up to human contemplation He has drawn men unto Him. Why should the scientist accept the dogma of the Saviour's power when he can see its effects? Napoleon recognized this when he exclaimed. "If I should die to-morrow not one of these devoted sodders would make any sacrifice for "If I should die to-morrow not one of these devoted sodders would make any sacrifice for me, while, for the Nazarene, men are as ready to give up their lives to-day as when He was on earth, eighteen centuries ago."

Doppler and Huggins, with their spectroscopes, ascertaining confidently the proper motions of the stars, would, if doubting the dogma of Christianity, become as ridiculous as Brother Jasper, who, finding his potato on the stump in the morning, questions the dogma of the durinal motion of the earth. Why will not selentific criffs aprix the same tests to Christianity and its forces? Bishop Potter's sermon, yerse and its forces? Bishop Potter's sermon.

Natural Fatth and Dogma.

TO THE POITOR OF THE SUN-Sir: While fully accord with the stand taken by THE SUN, that the Christian's faith primarily rests upon dogma, and dogma alone, I do not wholly agree with the state ment that "the believer must start out by accepting Christ as the Son of God." Convinced by the power of matural reason that there is an existing God, men are led to "seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him" (Acts, avti., 27), as the ultimate object of their desires; and the first step is purely one of natural faith.

Man seeks God, as his ultimate desire, through the power of natural reason, and accepts his authority by natural faith alone. His attitude toward Jesus as a divinely revealed Saviour, however, depends upon his faith in the Bible as the Word of God, the authoritative nature of which rests absolutely upon dogma. PIULABELPHIA, July 7.

The Secret of Sweet Corn-Live Near Your

To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN-Sir : I beg leave to differ with your correspondent of July 5 in regard to awest corn. I think it is not the fault of the farmer or gardener that sweet corn cannot be found. in cities, at least. It has to be gathered hours before being brought to market, and it very soon heats and the milk changes. Any one having a garden of his own can easily prove what I say. To be really sweet corn should be cooked as soon as possible after it has been gathered. A chemical change takes place if gathered long, for which there is no help. As to bearing, a farmer told me yesterday that some sweet corn was fully as productive as any other. Many miles have I walked in city markets looking for sweet corn and saying if I was a market gardener I would raise nothing but sweet corn. I am convinced it would be useless. You must live near your Lier Monegas, July 8.

Another One.

To the Entrop or The Sun-Sir: Why your green corn correspondents never get good sweet corn is not that it is not grown. They can have Stowell's Evergreen, Country Gentleman, Black Mexican and many other good varieties.

The trouble is that no corn is sweet many

hours after it is taken from the stalk unless it is tisked as soon as picked.

from the stalk its source of nourishment is out off and then the husk has to draw nourishment from the cob, leaving the ourn without nourishment on the is con, several corn lower doubts this let him get from if the sweet corn lower doubts this let him get from it the sweet corn, busking field one dozen or more ears of corn, busking half, leaving the balance unbusked until her when he will then have such corn as city people

day, when he wan the same as a summer vegetables, another stem for all lovers of summer vegetables, as timings, beets, carrots, Ac.:

When these vegetables are pulled the tops should be at once out off, for the tracen that while the vegetable in the ground it is receiving intertainment, and when pulled that is out off, and then the tops and when pulled that is out off, and then the tops and when pulled that is out off, and then the tops and when pulled that is out off. s flieir life from the vegetable, as and favories, as also should be shelled as soon as picked, as long in the pod they lose all delicate favor, the lovers of sacet off and summer vegetables it reat them as I have shown they will, I know, nk Tor says for this communication.

G. C. WIGHING, N.J. July 10.

Neither Giggle Nor Niggle.

To THE EDITION OF THE SUN-SIG: The case of Regions. Nearly is on for trial on July 12 in the Mumapal Court, Fifth District, 154 Clinton street. The names are not pronounced as though spelled "Gig-gle vs. Niggle," though Justice Boile so pronounced them in reading the calendar this morning. How long shall fustice continue to insult our citizens with mounts? GOEBEL IN RENTUCKY.

Nominated by Trick-Can His Returning Board Elect Him?-Extraordinary State of Affairs in the Kentucky Democracy.

From the Galveston Daily News. When the convention met there were 200 delegates instructed for Goebel, 350 for Stone and about 540 for Hardin, but there were some 300 contested seats. In order to prevent Hardin from organizing the convention, Goebel proposed a combination with Stone. It was ancounced in the press that by the terms of this agreement Stone was to receive the Gubernatorial nomination and Goebel was to con-trol the balance of the ticket, and was also to name the Chairman of the Convention. Since the Convention Capt. Stone has given out the following signed statement relative to the agreement between Goebel and himself:

We met, and Goebel stated that he had informed Judge liedwine that the latter was to be the perma-nent Chairman of the convention. He declared that if I would agree that the temporary organization should become permanent he would agree that every vote of the city of Louisville and all of his vote in the convention should be cast for me, and thus make me the number of the convention. He said he had votes enough to make either Gon. Hardin or myself the nominee; that he preferred to make me the nominee. He declared that he would not fail to give me the votes. I informed my friends of this agreem at and pledge. On Saturday, when Gen. Hardin with frew his name, my friends de-manded that Guebel keep his pledge to me. Some of my friends and some of his own friends went to him to demand that he keep his agreement made Friday. Goobel came across the stage to where I war seated and asked me if I were nominated and elected I would allow him to name two persons to fill places that I would have the power to hil. I told

thoulel asked me if I would agree to put the pledge in writing. I told him that it was not necessary, as I always kept my word and would do it in that instance. He asked me to wait until be could consult with his friends. I said: "No, keep your pl-dge to me now and give me the votes that you promised me, and thus make me the nominee." He said. "I'll do it. Wait until I can walk over to the other side of the stage, and I'll be back immediately." He left WILLIAM J. STONE. me and never returned.

Efforts to interview Mr. Goebel, the nomines, have falled, but in reply to Capt. Stone's charge of treachery and bad faith the friends of the nominee assert that he never agreed to nominate Stone, and affirm that the only agreement between them was as to the organization. Their explanation follows:

They say that when Goebel and Stone entered into an agreement the agreement was written. That written agreement provided that in Stone-Hardin contests Stone delegates should be seated; in Goebel-Hardin contests Goebei delegates should be seated, and in other contests Stone and Goebel men should be seated half and half. The agreement also provided that Goebel should name the chairman of the State Central Committee and Stone the member from the State at large. There was absolutely nothing in it about the Gubernatorial nomination.

The Memphis Commercial Appeal considers that these documents place both Goebel and Stone in a disreputable light. It seems that by the agreement Goebel and Stone made a bargain by which they were to ignore utterly

by the agreement Goebel and Stone made a bargain by which they were to ignore utterly the merits of the various contests, and wore to throw out the Hardin delegates, no matter whicher the latter were elected or not, wherever their seats were contested. Anogether, some 300 delegates were inscated, and fully two-thiris of them were instructed for Hardin. In one county the Hardin delegates had been elected by a vote of five to one, but they were instantiated by a vote of five to one, but they were instantiated by a vote of five to one, but they were instantiated by a vote of five to one, but they were instantiated by a vote of five the interest of the combine. Thus we find scores of Santicky Democrats done to a turn by the unboy method of counting votes out or in, to suit the purposes and interests of their leaders, which they approved and voted for in the Legislature of the state.

The Goebellaw chickens came home to roost. It was by them made the law of the State as a means of counting in or out whomsoever they preferred, regardless of the number of votes cast for the candidatos. The author of the act, with other prominent Democrats to help him, applies a similar rule to members of his own party, to Hardin delegates, to Democrats who voted for the Goebel law. Whether the brilliant young Kentuckian is going to find himself able by the employment of the wonderful election machinery devised by him and adopted by his party to have Goebel counted in and the other fellow counted out remains to be seen. It is quite probable that he may, It also remains to be seen whether the Democrats of Kentucky will be content to remain under a law by which they are estopped in their compiants over even the rulings of Redwine and rebuked when they arise to demand for themselves a fair count.

WHAT HIS OHIO GAINED BY ITS The Bad Effect of Hounding the Standard

Oil Company from the State. From the Chicago Inter Ocean. The withdrawal of the Standard Oil Company from Ohio is announced. The cause of the move is the series of ouslaughts made on the corporation by the become tired of being treated as a public enemy. It will reorganize under the laws of New Jersey

This withdrawal means a great deal more than the transfer of the corporate domicile. To be sure such a transfer means that Cleveland, where the company has always had its headquarters, will lose a large office force and immense deposits of money; but these are small items compared with the great man-ufacturing plants which are to be abandoned. The refiners at Cleveland, the parent establishment and the second largest of its kind in the world, is to be left idle. Its cooperage factory—the largest one

ever operated -is already closed.

It is hardly foo much to say that the Standard Oil Company is to Cleveland what the Union Stock Yards are to Chicago. Each concern is the head centre of one of the greatest industries of the times. There is a great deal of refining in other cities than leveland, as there is a great deal of packing outside of Chicago, but Cleveland is largely indebted to the manufacture of kerosene from petroleum for its extraordinary presperity. It owes more to John Rockefeller than to any other dozen citizens.

When the oil fields of northern Pennsylvania were illing American homes with a brilliant and chesp but it agreeable and dangerous artificial light Mr. Rockefeller, then a poor man on a small salary, con-ceived the idea of a great central morpany to handle the product and improve the methods of manufacture. National the oil producers have had no little cause of complaint against the Standard, but the eneral public has no reason to complain, and never has had. Quality has been noproved to the point as near absolute perfection as it is possible to attain, and prices have been reduced and kept so low as to

occasion no complaint.

Objo has not only had its fair share of these benefits, but the liene share of the benefits from the manuta tures to which the business has given rise. Thousands of workingmen in Cleveland alone have for years been employed at good wages in the plants of the Standard Oil Company. All of them will now suffer. No industry, no class of people, can be benefited by the withdrawal of the com-pany from the Biate. Even the producers, however latter their feeling may be in the case, must see that they can derive to alkantage from this change of base. It is impossible to conceive any public advantage from the pursuit of a policy which is deproving Cleveland of a great industry and thousands of laboring men of employment except as they follow the company in its migration eastward.

The Attorney-General of Ohio may think he to making himself popular with the people by pelling a great corporation to leave the State, but the people especially the people of Cleveland-cannot fall to see that indulgence in spite work has brought relief from no burden, and in thousands of families is bound to substitute gaunt idleness for This is for the reason that when the ear is taken | comfortable industry.

From the Chicago Tribune. Customer-Some of these combs are marked 78 cents and others \$2.75, and they look exactly alike. What's the difference? Salesgirl-Those are tortoise shell and these are

real tortoise shell. Anti-Kissing Myook of Hmawsa.

From the America Rasar Patrika. Two Burmans, one of whom is a lad of 17, were sentenced to six months and four months' rigorous imprisonment each by the Myork of Hinawas for attempting to kiss a young itermese girl.

Gen. Joe Wheeler in South Carolina Pyes. From the Charleston News and Courses.

Alse for Gen. Wheeler! Having failed to obtain the liberty of his non-country, he is willing to de stroy that of the Filipines.

Fire in a Boston Lumber Yard. From the Baston Evening Transcript. Boaton had another of those frequent inflammatory attacks in her lumber region yesterday evening.